

Complete Text of

Question-and-Answer

Vice President Spiro T. Agnew Thursday fielded questions posed by members of the staffs of The Times-Picayune and New Orleans States-Item for approximately 80 minutes in an exclusive interview for the newspapers.

Ashton Phelps, president and publisher of The Times-Picayune Publishing Corp., presided over the press conference.

Representing The Times-Picayune were George W. Healy Jr., editor; Arthur F. Felt Jr., associate editor, news; Fritz Harsdorff, city editor; Vincent Randazzo, assistant city editor; Malcolm Forsyth, of the editorial department; and Paul Atkinson, James H. Gillis and Frank Schneider, reporters.

Heading the States-Item group were Editor Walter G. Cowan and Charles A. Ferguson, associate editor. Others included City Editor John Wilds; David Snyder and Les Brumfield, editorial writers; Ralph Vinson, cartoonist; and Gene Bourg and Charles Zewe, reporters.

Following is the complete text of the question and answer session.

MR. PHELPS: Gentlemen, we are very honored to have the vice president here with us. He has generously agreed to answer your questions. Before that, I think he will have a few remarks that he will want to make to us.

Policy of Visiting Papers Explained

VICE-PRESIDENT AGNEW: Thank you, Mr. Phelps. I am very pleased to be here in New Orleans and meet with your editorial boards and your staffs. What I decided to do about a year ago was to attempt, wherever possible, to go into a city where there was a newspaper that had a very good circulation and was an opinion-molder in the community and try to hold rather very comprehensive interviews on a question and answer basis.

I started this with the Miami Herald. I have done it with the

NEW ORLEANS, LA., FRIDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 9, 1970

Agnew's Session

Session for Vice-President

with Editors

Los Angeles Times and with one or two others.

This is the first I have done in this area, and probably will be the only one because I don't envisage that I will have a great amount of time to go into a lot of cities. I will have to just pick one or two organs in a particular geographic area.

I think yours is very typical of your area and does a very good job of disseminating the news. So I am very pleased to have this chance to be with you.

I am perfectly willing for this to be on the record. It will be, of course, exclusive and before I take too much time, I know you have a lot of questions. So I just say, fire away.

MR. HEALY: Do you see any hope of the coastal states receiving a reasonable share of the oil and gas production to compensate for special services they render to the crewmen and members of their families who

work on these rigs?

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Yes, I see some hope of it. I know this is a very touchy subject. I know the Gulf Coast feels its case is unique and they resent comparison with California where there are great disparities in the value of the land — the shoreline as opposed to the offshore assets. The Administration is cognizant of these fears.

I am not going to say that I think everything has worked out, because I know there are great difficulties that have to be solved yet. But I know the Interior Department is well aware of the conflicts and will continue to work with the authorities in these states to try to reach some reasonable solution.

MR. COWAN: Does the Administration have any particular inside information at this time that Russia will nudge the North Vietnamese to accept President Nixon's proposals of Wednesday night?

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Well, I can't discuss a matter

so sensitive as any behind-the-scenes diplomacy. I have made it a rule during the process of interviews to stay studiously away from such sensitive diplomatic negotiations.

I want to make one thing clear. The fact that I have avoided this question should not be taken as evidence that that situation does exist. I have to be consistent and simply evade that question; not because I want to be evasive. But simply because public discussion of these things sometimes impairs progress—if progress is possible.

MR. COWAN: Just reading between the lines I had thought that this move came at this time because the Administration did have hopes that Russia would intercede.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: I can say this. Our contacts with the Soviet Union are in depth and of a continuing nature on every subject, and we continue to try to maintain the closest kind of exchange of in-

formation. We are constantly probing for ways of relieving tensions all over the world.

Polarization Said Unfairly Stated

MR. BRUMFIELD: Mr. Vice President, many of your critics have accused you of contributing to the polarization of the country. If I recall correctly, you replied that polarization along the issues—or people polarization—was healthy. And that, indeed, unanimity of opinion was a myth. Yet the President in his campaign for election, campaigned to unify the country. Would it be improvident to say that you believe the way to achieve unity is sort of like making an omelet, you must first crack the eggs?

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: I don't think that is a fair characterization of my position.

The point the President was making in his inaugural address was that the people of diverse political opinions, having just completed a highly adversary exercise known as the American election, could for the moment move away from purely partisan considerations and attempt wherever possible to cooperate in carrying out the mandate of the people in that election, which

was, of course, the program that President Nixon campaigned on.

Now I have taken the position that as we move closer to another election, we have an adversary political climate developing again. It always gets most intense close to an election.

My assignment is a highly-political one. My assignment is to elect people of the philosophical, ideological and political background who will support President Nixon's programs. In order to do this, I must distinguish between them and the people they are running against. Of course, this is not exactly a 'bring-us-together-climate' as far as candidates where there are firm supporters within parties are concerned.

There is not an attempt on my part to polarize over such matters as race, or creed, or economic advantage. This is purely a political polarization. We are out to attract as many voters as we can to the programs that we think are best for the country. We want Democrats as well as Republicans. This is the kind of polarization I refer to as positive polarization.

You know yourself we don't give our President an overwhelming mandate. I can't think of an election where a President has received 60 per cent of the vote in this country. That means at least 40 to 45 per cent of the people had to be against him even when he took office. So that is a polarization in itself.

Exclusion of Some from Rest Desirable

Now I have said on occasion this kind of political polarization over issues aside, it's valuable for us to remember that in a nation with over 200 million people everyone cannot become a productive and contributing member of society. We have our prisons, institutions for psychopaths, paranoids and other psychotic personalities. We have always had people in society who refused to perform their obligations to the broader community.

During World War I, we had a very high number of deserters, who wouldn't go to fight for

the country. We have had this type of people who turn to drugs and away from society. They are not new. Back in the early days, the Bowery in New York was a dramatization of the alcoholic dropout.

What I am saying is that it is not feasible and practical to expect that everybody can be brought into a productive citizenship. We must recognize it is important to separate some of these people from our society so they don't impede and impair our progress. Not in any callous way, but separate them for the good of the majority who want progress and want a good community.

MR. SCHNEIDER: What is your opinion of the Commission on pornography's report? What is the significance of this report and do you feel anything will ever come of it?

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Well, I confess that I have not read that long report in its entirety. It happens to be on my desk and I haven't gotten into it yet. I have read the accounts of the conclusions.

I am aware as any concerned parent would be of the focus in the entertainment world toward the complete license in matters that relate to sexual mores. I don't approve of this. I deplore the descent of the theatrical arts, for example, into postures where they are totally repelling and actually stated to be repulsive by some of the reviewers who attend many movies and plays.

A national weekly magazine's top man who reviews these plays just came flat out and said he couldn't take any more of this kind of thing. And I think it is wrong to assume that the Danish approach to this matter—which is that if you make it as commonplace as bacon and eggs, no one will listen to it any more—I think that is a fallacy.

Smut Corrosive to Young Minds

Young people have intense drives in many directions. One of them is a very high sexual drive. It is very, very bad to take a young mind that doesn't have the balance of experience and subject him or her to this kind of material. It has a corrosive effect on his personality.

The worst thing it does, in my judgment, is that it takes up time this young person could be applying to appreciation of other forms of entertainment and art. It would be beneficial because these other forms have a tendency to reinforce an effective and contributing role in community relations with other people. So I am very much against the permissive attitude that is in the report and I think that what has happened to our motion pictures, some of our music, certainly the plays that are in the legitimate theater, the off-Broadway theater, is pretty bad.

And I think most of the people who thought this was a novelty at first are getting rather sick of it. It makes a rather indigestible diet of material that doesn't lead to any gratification of the senses, just a blunting of the one animal characteristic.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Vice President, you just stated your attitude on this particular matter, what would you do about it? Or indeed would you attempt to regulate it?

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Well, we have a proposed group of bills before the Congress now which would make it much more difficult to disseminate this information through the mails and encourage the exercise of much more rigid standards of social acceptability. It is the most difficult area in which to legislate — there isn't any question about it. It is almost impossible to tell when you get to the line when something becomes so in bad taste that it is unacceptable. It depends on the contemporary feeling in the community.

I think we should attack it from the point of view that we must protect our young people from being inundated without their solicitation in many cases by this kind of material. We must regulate the mails in that respect.

Beyond that, it becomes a matter of the standards of judgment by those people in the advertising community and in the theatrical community to police themselves to the extent they don't foist this material on the public. Beyond that, it becomes a matter of the average citizen — this might be the most important of all — refusing at the box office to support this material.

And, of course, the novelty of

it has been of such impact that it has been very successful financially, which is one of the problems we have with it. But I don't claim that it is an easy thing. It is difficult to cope with. We should go back in the other direction.

In my judgment, the attitude of simply opening it up and saying, well if everybody looks at it, it will go away; this is not feasible. In Denmark, the claim is made that it has reduced sex crimes a great deal. The truth of that matter, according to experts along that subject, what used to be sex crimes, are not sex crimes any more. They are still happening but they are no longer criminal misdemeanors. So therefore it shows a great reduction.

MR. WILD: What do you see as the long-range prospects of the space program? We are particularly interested because we build the boosters here.

Decline in Space Support Analyzed

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Well, as chairman of the Space Council, I have been naturally somewhat disappointed because our public support for the space program diminished to some extent due to the requirement of additional domestic spending and also there was some attractive reaction because of the failure of the last Apollo shot to generally accomplish its mission, though there was great public rejoicing that the wonderful feat of recovery was achieved.

Our space program, competing as it does with so many other vital and highly expensive federal efforts and domestically, our efforts to implement the Nixon Doctrine by moving our troop presence down but at the same time maintaining our military assistance to those nations collaborating in their own defense, this has to discourage the space program.

I don't think we should be glum about it forever, because I see the Russians are moving very energetically again in their

space program and we are to some extent human enough to react that as we see them making additional progress, the spur will come to us to accelerate our efforts — just as it did when they put up Sputnik. We are a very highly competitive people. I think we are going to go along with it; not as fast as first predicted after the heady wine of that first moon landing, but I do believe it is a very important thing to proceed with.

We must recognize this is the true frontier we face in the world today, and even though the benefits of space exploration may be only relative to the ancillary programs connected with it that effect the environment, matters of that type. Nonetheless, it is a vast unknown out there and we don't know in 100 years how important something out there we may discover will be to us. We just have to continue to test our frontiers.

MR. PHELPS: Mr. Vice-President, what do you see in relation to the end of the draft and the establishment of a professional army?

Volunteer Army Long-Range Goal

VICE-PRESIDENT AGNEW: I think that once we have the war in Vietnam over, we then have the door open to establish a truly professional army. As to the draft, I don't think it is reasonable to think that even with the lower levels of military maintenance in personnel who are necessary with the war being wound down to some extent that we can move into implementation of a volunteer army immediately.

But I think as a long range goal, it is a good one. Frankly, I like it a lot better than the idea of total conscription that has been advanced, military and nonmilitary, for young people.

One of the great benefits of the draft reform has been that we no longer have young people subjected to the draft for six or seven years; they are at least able to limit their vulnerability to the one year and make their plans accordingly.

MR. PHELPS: To me, the es-

establishment of a professional army in this day and age of technology makes so much sense, to train people for two or three years and then turn them loose isn't economical or rational, if you can do it the other way.

MR. GILLIS: Mr. Vice-President, I have read where you are criticizing the candidacy of Mr. (New York Sen. Charles E.) Goodell. The thing that I would like to know is what effect on the two-party system and specifically on the Republican party, would a victory by Mr. (James L.) Buckley have?

Sen. Goodell Falls in Unique Category

VICE-PRESIDENT AGNEW: Let me say that Mr. Goodell comes into a unique category, first of all. I haven't singled out any other Republican candidates for special consideration except Mr. Goodell. He has made some statements in the course of his divorce from the Nixon administration that have not simply been in the response to the request he define his positions, but gratuitous and vicious attacks on his President and Administration. In ad-

dition, he has made some very inflammatory statements.

I can recall one where he indicated after the trial of the Chicago Eight or Seven—however many it turned out to be—that he thought Judge Hoffman was more dangerous than 10 Abbie Hoffmans. Well, it is this kind of thinking that lends aid and comfort to the violent, radical Left that is in the forefront that is attempting to persuade our youth that working in the system is no longer a viable way to achieve results. This kind of attitude makes him in my judgment what I refer to as a radical liberal. He's an obstructionist; totally at home. He is isolationist beyond any rational belief. He is encouraging the permissive attitude that finds more faults with law enforcement officers than with the victims of crime. I have indicated that.

Now Mr. Buckley happens to be a registered Republican. It is true that he is not the nominee of the Republican Party at that convention, although he had broad support. He is totally supportive in his campaign of the President. I have not endorsed him speci-

cally. I have simply ruled out support of either of the other two candidates. I think it is a fair conclusion for me to say that if Mr. Buckley won his race, the Administration wouldn't go over in a corner and cry about it. I think that this business of crossing of party lines as I have done to single out a member of my own party is a very serious matter and I didn't do it frivolously. But Mr. Goodell is unique. If you look at the statements Mr. Goodell made during his time in the House and compare them with some of the statements I have been referring to, you will find he

is truly the Christine Jorgensen of the Republican Party.

MR. ZEWE: — Mr. Vice President, one of the things Mr. Goodell has said is that in your statements you are implying that people who disagree with the administration are somehow like people who trash campuses, burn banks and blow up math centers. Goodell has also accused you of using tactics similar to those of the late Sen. McCarthy in your attack on your critics. Would you comment on this, and do you have similar things in store for all Republicans who disagree with your comments and those of the President?

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Well, I think I made it perfectly clear that I consider Sen. Goodell unique.

Senator 'Thrives' on Disagreement

I just came out of Pennsylvania where I came out rather strongly for the Senate Minority Leader who has been known to disagree with the administration on subject matter. I have supported other candidates who have differences of opinion with the administration and who have voted against the administration out of their convictions. But I think if you compare the Goodell situation with these other people, the first thing you will notice is there has not been an intentional exacerbation for private political gain of the individual, of the relationship between the individual and the administration. Now that is what Sen. Goodell seems to thrive on, it is his bag, as the common slang of today goes, to upbraid and disagree with the adminis-

tration. I said that in my judgment he has burned his Republican credentials because his attacks have been motivated not just out of conviction to register disagreement but out of conviction to utilize his adversary position to the administration to encourage personal support of people who are fighting the administration.

Now I am not going to continue to make a campaign out of opposing Sen. Goodell. This may very well be one of the last days I will mention Sen. Goodell. I have too many radical liberals to take care of, and I am trying to do it as I go around the country.

MR. FELT: You may not want to telegraph your punches but do you plan to go into Tennessee?

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: I have been into Tennessee, and we had a very good two days there, including a television interview there. We had a good rally. I think we had 10,000 to 12,000 people there. Bill Brock's campaign is going extremely well. Sen. (Albert) Gore seems to be in a little bit of trouble back there in his home state with the voters. I don't mean political trouble. He came to the airport to meet me and I told him I thought that was a touching farewell gesture.

MR. SNYDER: You came out very strongly against Sen. Gore. Did the Carswell matter have a lot to do with that?

Gore Classified Radical Liberal

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: No, I find Sen. Gore has a broad record that puts him into

the category of radical liberal. He certainly has lined up with the small group of people in the Senate who have obstructed the programs of the administration. He fits the definition very adequately and the Carswell matter is just one facet of a long record of the kind of thinking that I think the American people don't need in the Senate any more.

He supported all of the anti-war amendments that sought to tie the President's hands. He pontificated about what he called the terrible Cambodian invasion, when by now it should be perfectly clear to all of us that we couldn't have the type of

cease-fire offer made by the President last night if we hadn't had a Cambodian excursion. Casualties are at their lowest level in four and one-half years. The war is truly winding down. We are gradually bringing the other party members who are not of the radical liberal brand to a unanimity of position with the Administration in our effort to solve the war. I noticed in the paper this morning that quite a few Democratic leaders commented favorably on the President's position—people such as Sen. Jackson and Sen. Mansfield and those people in the Senate who have not been able to agree with the President on the direction but who nonetheless who have been seeking a broad ground on which we can make a united proposal in regard to ending the war.

Sen. Gore domestically is a big spender. He has proposed billions of dollars of spending in the course of his time in the Senate. I don't think he is truly representative of the people of Tennessee and I think he has also encouraged the kind of permissive thinking and acceptance of rationalization of disruptive tactics on the campuses and streets of our country that represent the thinking of his Georgetown friends more than the people of his own state.

Explains Apparent Transformation

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Vice President, you have undergone, I think it is fair to say, sort of a political transformation. You were elected governor of Maryland as a liberal moderate candidate. After that, you were a big booster of New York Gov. (Nelson) Rockefeller.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Still a big booster.

MR. FERGUSON: He is certainly a liberal by most standards. Yet now you seem to be changing to the more conservative side. Why is that?

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: It is a good question. I am glad you asked that. I want to develop it and think through it with you.

First of all, I still have great admiration for Gov. Rockefeller. The things he had advocated on the domestic scene that gave him a liberal image are things that I supported as governor of Maryland and would still support today. I am talking about the war against pollution. I modeled the Maryland pro-

gram against water pollution after the New York program.

Some of our mass transit problems, I utilized New York solutions in Maryland. I got through a \$130 million bond is-

Continued in Sec. 1, Page 21

Continued from Sec. 1, Page 20

me, which was one of the first in the water states for a comprehensive war on water pollution.

I thought very strongly that there hadn't been adequate minority race representation in the Maryland government and I appointed more Negroes to high positions than had ever been appointed before. I recommended Negroes to draft boards, which had never been done before.

These things are generally characterized as liberal actions, when you look at the difference between liberal and conservative five or six years ago. I haven't changed in those things. I would propose the same things today.

Unlawfulness Said Point of Departure

Now where I left the liberal philosophy was when it began to develop into a rationalization and acceptance of unlawful disruptive conduct. I felt the same way about that then as I do now. In short, what I am saying to you is, I haven't changed. There is no place where you can look at my record and point to any change I have made in my political convictions. If you can, I would like to know what it is. But I have never seen anybody who is able to develop such an inconsistency. Now I supported Gov. Rockefeller because I had great admiration for his positions on these things—his innovative thinking. I still do.

One of the things I want to point out is that Gov. Rockefeller supports the President's efforts in Vietnam, comprehensively and thoroughly. He has something of a reputation of being somewhat of a Hawk, in the general spectrum of political leaders. So with those answers I would attempt to extract from you gentlemen in the room, some evidence of any change that I have made in my philosophy because I have honestly, conscientiously sought

where this allegation of change and inconsistency has come from and I can't find it. Can you suggest any issue on which I have changed my position?

MR. FERGUSON: Well, sir, I don't know enough about it to name specifically, but I think a general impression is that you went from being a more liberal moderate . . .

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: That is a general impression.

MR. FERGUSON: To being more of a conservative. I think your rhetoric which you say is in the framework of legitimate political activity, that which many claim that Mr. (Pat) Buchanan over here is somewhat responsible for, has a lot to do with it. But I have no specific . . .

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Well, you see that is exactly the point I would like to make. It is not fair for people in the news media to reach general impressions without being able to back them up with specifics. Because your general impressions become the general impressions of a lot of people all over the country.

And when you speak of rhetoric, I spoke out just as violently and strongly against unlawful conduct when I was a county official in Baltimore and when I was governor of Maryland.

You may not remember this but one of the biggest tests of fair play among races was the Gwen Oak Park dispute in 1963 when I was the county executive of Baltimore County when a group of Negroes tried to use entertainment facilities and there was a march and demonstration. I got in that dispute and successfully negotiated the opening of that park to the blacks. It took me eight days of steady negotiating to achieve that. I still feel that if that happened again today I would get in it again, and try to negotiate that solution.

The point I make to you today is that I don't think it is really fair to come up with these broad characterizations without having the facts to back them up. The general impression—that's a pretty weak way of saying somebody said this and it sounds logical. Let's get down to the nitty-gritty of what we are really talking about.

MR. PHELPS: May I ask a question on that? I think a good part of that impression is attributable to the so-called Southern

strategy and the inability to reconcile Nelson Rockefeller with Strom Thurmond.

Southern Strategy Existence Denied

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Well, that may well be. I deny the existence of a Southern strategy. All you have to do is look at the results of the last election and see who was the regional candidate. Mr. (Hubert H.) Humphrey's vote came from one little region of the country, while Mr. Nixon's votes came from all over the

country. We won a national strategy, not a Southern Strategy.

MR. PHELPS: I wasn't trying to argue that . . .

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: I understand.

MR. PHELPS: I was trying to understand why that atmosphere might exist.

MR. RANDAZZO: How do you personally evaluate the success of your speaking engagements throughout the country?

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Do you mean in this campaign?

MR. RANDAZZO: Yes.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: I think we are getting through to a lot of people. I have been very pleased with the coverage we have had in the states we have visited, and with the interest of the media in doing in-depth discussions and examinations, particularly with these television panels I have been before.

Fortunately, when we go in, it is not just one station. The other stations seem to send representatives, and we get a broad cross section of the opinion of a community in the formulation of questions. Wednesday in Pittsburgh, the station had spent two weeks developing questions by soliciting them from the audience, when I came, what did the audience want to ask me? It was a very different and a very interesting program, bringing out things that we didn't expect to come up. Such as the size of postage stamps.

MR. RANDAZZO: Do you think you are convincing the American people that maybe your philosophy of government may be right, more so than when you burst upon the scene as Vice President?

Public Rejecting

'Simplistic' Agnew

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: I think the public is beginning to reject the simplistic characterization of Agnew, as a person of very dogmatic, inflexible views, non-progressive, authoritarian viewpoint. I think the public sees enough of me now to recognize that I am not completely one way or the other. I try to call the issues as I see them, and I am encouraged about that.

MR. HARSDDORFF: On the question of law and order, the crime rate continues to rise and it appears that the local police departments are not going to be able to handle it. What do you see as the federal government's role in this so far as subsidies to local police departments or the possibility of citizens' participation in law enforcement?

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: You probably are aware that the President's Crime Package — some 12 out of the 14 bills have been stymied. Fortunately, one of them concerning organized crime broke loose Wednesday, came through the House. I attribute the movement of some of those bills in the package to the high visibility we have been giving the problem. I have been talking all over the country about this business of making a concerted effort on crime.

We recognize that law enforcement is to a great extent a local matter. But with the proper assistance and funding from the federal government, with the proper interstate precautions that are involved in some of these bills, we can be of great assistance.

One of the things that not many people realize is that 21 law officers have been violently killed in the last year. Many of these were killed in totally unprovoked assaults — sitting in a patrol car and having someone shoot them through the window.

This climate that encourages that kind of assault on authority comes to some extent from the erosion in the mind of a certain

segment of the general public that may be inclined to criminal tendencies. That is why I say that when I hear public officials sympathizing with Black Panther indictments, listening to the dictates of fugitives from justice such as Rap Brown and Eldridge Cleaver, that we are indeed heading into an era — if we don't do something about it — where many more people will be encouraged to take on criminal activity.

It is becoming socially more acceptable to be a criminal. This is an interesting thing about crime generally that I have been reflecting on for some time.

The deterrents to a life of crime are not just incarceration, and being fined and having your worldly goods taken away. The principal deterrent to crime — or one of them — is the public stigma that attaches to the convicted criminal.

Now what we have been going through is a metamorphosis that at least blurs or dulls that stigma by allowing the criminal to designate the reason for his criminal activity some lofty political motive. That takes away a lot of the deterrent to crime when these people characterize themselves as political activists.

We liberated the hot dog stand. We didn't steal the hot dogs. We trashed the neighborhood to show our contempt for the free enterprise system! This assignment of political reasons gives a rationale to criminal conduct and it is a great stimulus to people who want to perform their criminal acts for the same old benefits of assisting themselves personally. They are now able to say they are doing it for the community.

MR. BOURG: Mr. Vice President, there is a feeling among the mayors of American cities and towns that their problems are not being adequately dealt with by the Administration. They note that funds from the Safe Streets Act instead of going to the cities went to the state capital for political distribution rather than on need and getting at crime where the problems were. What priorities does the Administration place on the social and economic problems of the cities?

Most Safe Streets Funds Go to Cities

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW:

A very high priority.

There has been a great deal of misunderstanding about the business of trying to coordinate the utilization of funds with state and local governments. On that particular Safe Streets Bill you mention, there are mandatory pass-throughs to the cities which leave the governors no latitude about withholding those monies. There are also criteria that are applied—such as density of population and crime statistics that force the lion's share to be passed through to the cities, the densely-populated areas.

Now one of the biggest mistakes we have made as a nation in the past 15 years in my judgment—and I speak as a former county officer in a singular type county where all the functions of a county of 600,000 people were performed by the county government, were no unincorporated towns or cities or school districts; we were, in fact, a city, surrounding Baltimore city but separate and distinct.

I speak with the knowledge that crime and other urban problems such as blight, decay, stagnation, pollution don't stop at city lines. And we were embarked on a course of action that was dedicated toward the use of the artificial city boundaries as the place where the assistance stopped. Now this was

causing a great amount of trouble in the rest of the state because the state legislatures were upset because the cities were singled out for special attention but the outer edge of the cities—which had all the problems, decay, pollution, all the things the mayor was trying to fight—were not able to get in on the solution to the problems. This making of federally-supported enclaves within states created this climate of hostility which exists even today between cities and their surrounding subdivisions. We will never be able to solve the problem of the urban-impacted areas—cities and counties—until the governors, county officials and mayors take the leadership and recognize that the problems have to be solved on a regional planning basis.

One of the things I did when I was county executive was we had parts of the county which were just as dense as the city of Baltimore, up against the

city. I got together with the mayor. We set up some ways to save our taxpayers some money. One of the ways was we took my county and two other counties and the city and we began to have joint purchasing of such items as gasoline. We were able to save a lot of money by buying in much larger units. We set up employment offices and a job computer bank that allowed people to apply for jobs in any of the subdivisions at two or three different convenient locations.

Efficient Regional Approach Sought

What we were trying to do was to move efficiently toward a cooperative, regional approach to our mutual problems.

Now the federal course—I didn't mean to make such a dissertation, but I feel this is a very important part of what is going to happen to our society—it has been to establish a particular empathy with the city and disregard the fact that around the periphery grows another city outside the boundaries which must be taken into consideration also. And that the hostilities of federal assistance to the cities without extending it to the suburbs has created a climate of distrust that is principally bringing about an influx of most of our Negro citizens to the core city where there are more social programs, where the community action agencies are functioning more. In all too many instances, these become isolated federal enclaves that stand dependent upon the federal government, hostile to the state and the local governments which surround them. This is a very bad thing.

MR. BOURG: The Administration's just announced that it plans to give mayors more freedom in spending Model Cities funds. Is this an indication of, perhaps, more federal revenue sharing with the cities in the future?

Spending Freedom for Cities Backed

VICE-PRESIDENT AGNEW: Well, the Administration's viewpoint is that, because of these matters that I've outlined in a rather convoluted fashion, I'm sorry it's very difficult. We could spend a whole day on the subject, but because of these disabilities that grow out of the complexity of intergovernmental

relations, that the best encouragement for a solution to these problems is to give the states and the local governments more of a say in how they utilize their money. And one problem is that the federal government has tried to be big daddy too long and setting down too many restrictions on the employment of monies—restrictions that more or less are artificially contrived

by standards that don't represent the thinking of the community where the money's going—and that there should be more money available for mayors and for county officials. And the governor should be encouraged to hold regular, mutually-exploratory sessions with the local officials so that they can come to some idea of how they're going to plan the employment of their funds.

Now federally, it's perfectly obvious to me that there should be transportation grants with great flexibility in the government in how to use these.

If you have a grant available for mass transit, it doesn't mean anything to the state of Wyoming or Nevada. They don't need mass transit, but they'd like to use that money for roads. Conversely, there may be a great amount of money available for a large state industrial metropolis for roads and they'd like to convert that to the mass transit spending.

They should have the right to employ money in broad, general categories—transportation, health—to meet their particular problems.

In the health area some states have a particular problem with mosquito control, for example. They should be able to spend more money in that area than a state that has no mosquito problem.

So, we've got to stop moving away from the judgment that has been developing in the past 20 years, that the federal government knows exactly what should be done everywhere in the country, because the federal government doesn't know this and it's got too darned much to do in areas of its unique and exclusive responsibility to get involved in setting up all the criteria for every locality.

MR. ATKINSON: What is the future of the Republican Party



VICE PRESIDENT SPIRO T. AGNEW faces an audience of staff members from The Times-Picayune and New Orleans States-

Item Thursday during a question-and-answer session in the newspaper company's board room. Standing is Publisher Ashton Phelps.

Newspaper Executives Welcome Visitor



ROBERT E. GOUGH, general manager of The Times-Picayune Publishing Corporation, shakes hands with Vice President Spiro T. Agnew as the vice president arrived at the

newspaper plant Thursday. Also extending his greeting is Joseph I. Ross, acting business manager.

—Photo by The Times-Picayune

in Louisiana as you see it?

Hopes for 2-Party System in South

VICE - PRESIDENT AGNEW: Well, we hope that the South has become convinced that a two-party system is beneficial and will be productive of a greater awareness of the problems of the South in respect to its relations with the rest of the country. I'm one of those who happens to believe that the South has been treated in a rather shabby fashion, and I've said this in the North as well as the South.

I think that sometimes the intellectual community has tried to exact standards of excellence on the South that it does not implement in its own neighborhood. I'm hopeful that the South will see that it needs a two-party system. It needs a choice between candidates. It needs an adversary political climate to bring out the views that it needs to be expressed in a national forum.

I'm very encouraged by what's been happening. I had a meeting yesterday, as you know, with some of the Southern chairmen and these are men of very high credentials. I was really impressed with the quality of these chairmen.

They're doing an outstanding job in building the party in their states.

MR. COWAN: Your visit here today is obviously a good public relations move. In view of the great prestige of your office, I think that you are as well spoken as you are outspoken. I wonder if you have considered the same type of meeting with college officials and student protest leaders across the country.

I know you couldn't be a one-man troubleshooter, but in key areas to be a sort of troubleshooter.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: As you may know I did a 90-minute TV show with student leaders on the David Frost Show and I would like to do more of that. I would like to go to more campuses, but the big problem . . .

MR. COWAN: If the word gets around . . . you do one or two.

Just Being Heard Major Problem

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: The big problem is to be heard. Our universities are so immense. For example, you take the University of Wisconsin has 60,000 people and 30,000 are at Madison. If you have only one per cent of those people set upon disrupting the speaker, it becomes very difficult to be heard. I don't have any intent of subjecting myself to the kind of thoughtless, anti-intellectual harrassment that takes place when there are 200, 300 people out there dedicated to the fact that you are not going to be able to say anything.

If I were guaranteed an environment of quiet, rational discussion, a chance to do these things, I would do them. But if I go to some of these campuses and there are disruptions, the disruptions become the story and not what I have to discuss with the students. I can't take that chance.

MR. HEALY: Mr. Vice President, with President Nixon on the campus of Kansas State, wasn't it the other way around? The way the President handled the would-be harassment . . .

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Yes, but I think you have got to be aware there was an unusually-small number of disrupters at that appearance and there was a great turnout of students who wanted to hear the President. And I am not aware that anybody other than the President can guarantee that kind of turnout when he goes to a campus.

MR. FORSYTH: What prospects do you see this year for school unrest?

Continued Campus Unrest Forecast

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: I think we are going to continue to have some trouble but I don't think it is a developing problem. I think it is a receding problem. I would hope that after the first

of the year after a few dislocations and a few dramatic incursions have taken place — which I feel we have reason to expect in the early part of the semester—the bulk of the students will become very disgusted with this conduct and say 'Now we have tried all of this and it is not doing anything; let's fall back and take a new tack.' Also I detect a hardening in the attitudes of the college administrators and some of the faculty. But I think a great amount of the problem lies with a lot of faculty.

MR. WILD: Do you see any political significance to the non-violent alienation of students generally as they feed out of the colleges and into everyday life?

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: I used to be very concerned about this. People are extremely malleable and they are subject to the immediate standards of social conformity in the group they happen to belong to at that moment. And once a student — even if he may have been somewhat radical — leaves the college and goes to work for a corporation he immediately begins to readjust and abides by the standards of the group he is involved with. I think most of these people don't continue that type of activity when they get out and start making a living and raising a family.

MR. BRUMFIELD: Mr. Vice President, does the President support you in your evaluation of (various) reports?

Has Nixon Support in General Sense

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Well, I try never to speak for the President directly because I think it is a bad procedure for me to characterize what the President believes. It is best what he thinks to come from him.

But I think it is reasonable to expect that in a broad sense the President approves of what I am saying. I have never seen a Vice President go off hare-brained in direct opposition to his President and I have no intention of doing that either.

I want to clarify that by saying I don't clear everything I say with the President. I think he has a broad knowledge of what my philosophy is. I think he made his judgment as to whether it was an acceptable philosophy when he designated

me to run for vice president.

MR. ATKINSON: Mr. Vice President, you are ranked third in a poll of the Most Admired Americans behind President Nixon and the Rev. Billy Graham. Does this give you any future Presidential ambitions?

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW (Smiling): No, because it's amazing how those polls can change. I may be the third

most hated by next year. You never can tell.

MR. FERGUSON: May I ask a question along those lines? Political observers say that in order to be successful in national politics, you have to stay in the mainstream of things. Phillips seems to think the mainstream is sort of flowing in more of a conservative direction. Could you think ahead to a time when it might move in a more leftward direction and leave you perhaps on a dry rock, because I think that generally speaking you would be considered on the more conservative side.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: I have got to come back at you with the same request I made of you before. I don't think I would be left on a rock. Certainly my ideas about solving the urban communities to some people may be quite liberal. So I don't consider myself as an ultra-conservative or rightwinger, though I have been portrayed as such. So I have a lot of space in the middle of the stream. I try to avoid the rocks on either end.

MR. FERGUSON: You are undoubtedly right, but in terms of images that save the your rhetoric has conjured up with people, can you think of a time when that might ever come back and haunt you?

Rhetoric Shouldn't Be Singled Out

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Well, I hope that my image is being altered from day to day. I hope this exercise this morning has elements of image alteration included in it. As far as my rhetoric is concerned, this again is an image, a part of an image. If you have read my speeches, my rhetoric doesn't really justify being singled out from other people's rhetoric.

I often call attention to the

fact when I was on a diplomatic mission to Asia, the senator who happens to be the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee gratuitously called me a 'smart-aleck.' But nobody said that was unusual rhetoric. And when I was designated a vice presidential candidate, an ambassador to the United Nations referred to me as a 'two-bit hack politician.'

Simply because I use occasionally phrases and words that have not become tedious and commonplace in the political lexicon is no reason for me to be characterized as a distributor of extreme statements.

MR. SNYDER: Mr. Vice President, I think that what bothers some people is that to critics of the Administration your role becomes so much more — almost enemies of the people, to be crucified. This could possibly cut off full criticism of the Administration, which would be bad, I think. Have you any comments on this?

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: I can say sure I am trying to destroy Sen. Gore at the polls and I will keep on working for that end, because I think it is good for the country and this is our party's position.

But, conversely, there are those who have attempted consciously to destroy me at the polls. And why is my attempt at their destruction to be more condemned than their attempt at my destruction?

Editorially, some newspapers during the campaign have attempted to paint me as a completely unqualified, unacceptable candidate for Vice President. Now this is intellectual dishonesty. They may disagree with some of my conclusions, but I think I fit somewhere in an acceptable mold of education, ability and political belief that is representative of quite a few people in the country. Why is it this always comes from one direction?

Sure, I am an adversary to these people. But I have my own adversaries, but no one concerns himself with protecting me from them, so I don't feel constrained to try to protect them from me.

MR. WILD: On the local political scene, I wonder if you would talk a little more about the Administration's attitude in the race between Robert E. Lee and Hale Boggs for Congress in

the Second Congressional District. When the President came to New Orleans not long ago, he brought Mr. Boggs with him and introduced Mr. Boggs to Mr. Lee as, 'Your Congressman.'

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW (Smiling broadly): Well, it was accurate. (Laughter again). He was his congressman.

MR. WILD: Yesterday I thought that you were a little less than wholehearted in endorsing Robert E. Lee and I wonder if you would say anything.

Doesn't Know Lee on Personal Basis

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: As I tried to explain there, I have tried to restrict my campaign to gubernatorial and senatorial candidates. This has made congressmen around the country a little bit dissatisfied. Some of them think I should be working harder for the congressional candidates, but it is a

time problem. Now if I come into a state like this and devote an unusual amount of time to a congressional candidate, I stir congressional candidates to say all over the country, 'Well, if you did this much for that man, why don't you do the same for me?' It is not any lack of interest in this particular congressional candidate's seat, although I haven't been able to know him personally. I don't know anything about him personally. I have to be completely candid in saying that.

MR. FERGUSON: You evidently don't like either Mr. Gore or Sen. Fulbright, but I wonder if it would be possible to make a distinction between the two men. And I would like you, if you could, to say which do you think has more courage, that being a relative term. Is it easier to do what Mr. Fulbright has done or more difficult, or was it more difficult for Mr. Gore to take the positions he took on Carswell and Haynsworth knowing that he was coming up for re-election?

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Well, that puts me in a spot where I'm making . . . I'm asked to make an analysis between two men whom I haven't actually ever thought of in a comparative sense and I know that they're both unacceptable, as far as I'm con-

cerned, in the Senate or the United States, but beyond that I wouldn't want to go.

MR. ATKINSON: Mr. Vice President, how do you assess the performance of the press since you said in Houston in May that they are illiberal, self-appointed guardians of our destinies who would like to run the country without submitting to this elective process as we in public office do?

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: I don't think I referred to the press. I think that my... what was the subject of that?

MR. ATKINSON: This was taken out of this latest issue of Reader's Digest?

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Well, what does it say? I mean

MR. ATKINSON: It says there are

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: No, before the quote. What goes before the quote?

(Laughter)

MR. ATKINSON: How do you assess...

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: I have to know that...

MR. ATKINSON: Well, I say how do you assess the performance of the press since you said in Houston in May...

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Well, I understood your question, but what I'm saying is you've given me a quote but you haven't said, within my quote, who I was referring to when I said that.

MR. ATKINSON: Well, it was in the article in Reader's Digest that you referred to the press.

Some Newsmen Extremely Fair

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Have you got the article? I'm not sure it referred to the press. I think I might have referred to certain members of the intellectual community, but I'm not sure that that referred to the press at all. I have to see the full quote. I wouldn't refer to the press that way in a broad sense because there are people in the press who have been extremely fair to me. But I would like to see that when it appears. Does anybody have a copy of that? I am concerned. I'll answer it this way: That there are people who pontificate about how government should handle its every problem, who Monday-morning quarterback with the latest information available and make decisions after the

fact, and criticize those of us who've had to contend with the problems when the ball's still rolling. And these people are certainly not restricted to the members of the media. There are academicians that do the same thing, there are people who write in learned journals who are this way. They seem to have delegated to themselves an inviolate position of looking down from their citadels of revealed truth and telling those of us who have to scramble in the political arena how we should act. It gets a little hard to take sometimes.

MR. FORSYTH: Isn't that part of the lively discussion an open society like this should have?

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Exactly. That's why I began lambasting right into it. (Laughter.)

MR. FORSYTH: No, I mean, that should be done.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Sure. It should be done. And I should not accept it as revealed truth when it's pronounced, but jump into it and cut it up, which I try to do, when I disagree with them.

MR. ZEWE: Sir, is there any different affect when some academicians and newspaperman sounds off from wherever he happens to be standing, any difference in effect than when the President or the Vice President of the United States says something of similar...

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW:

Continued in Sec. 1, Page 22

aware of that.

Complains About Distorted Image

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW:

Well, I've been complaining about it, too, and I'll continue to complain about it. I complain about the intellectual dishonesty of some of the media, when they attempt to portray me as some sort of Neanderthal being who's never really thought through any problem, who's a political freak, who is in this office by virtue of a stream of unfortunate circumstances tantamount to earthquakes and tornadoes, and who now is totally unfit to make the judgments and to administer the office. And you'd have to admit, if you've looked at my cartoons, that that's the point of view that they tried to get across about this Vice President. Now if they were more fair to me and said simply that they disagree with what I am doing and that they don't think that my beliefs are the direction for the country, I wouldn't complain. But they attack me as a man too frequently, they attack me as, well you've seen the cartoons, Agnew on the leash being let out of the doghouse. I can quote on any number of highly personal and highly selective attacks on my intelligence and my integrity that I don't think are fair at all.

MR. FERGUSON: Sir, I guess there is only one redeeming thing though. The media has made your name a household word. (Laughter)

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Yes, I suppose so.

MR. ZEWE: Mr. Vice President, when the President was here several weeks ago, he spoke of a desegregation policy of firmness yet understanding. I was wondering if you could assess for us this progress of the first few weeks of school, of this biggest dose yet of desegrega-

Continued from Sec. 1, Page 21

Yes, on an individual man-to-man basis, there is a difference. But when you put together three or four of these voices, the voice amplified through the media becomes sometimes more important than the voice of a single Vice President.

MR. FERGUSON: I was just thinking about people inferring from what a Vice President, or a President might say for that matter, that this was of the unblind tone of the administration that might represent a viewpoint and therefore that there might be some reason for concern. Certainly that's the way many people have interpreted your remarks. I'm sure you're

tion and what lies in the future for Southern school systems?

Singling Out South Is Called Unfair

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Well, this was one of the subjects that the chairmen and I discussed yesterday and I was encouraged by the fact that even though there are some difficulties in sorting out the impact of certain court decisions in certain areas, that in most of the states things were going along as well as could be expected. This doesn't mean that everybody is happy about it. I told them simply this: the President is obligated by his Constitutional oath to enforce the laws of the nation. And those laws are as they are passed by the Congress and upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. But I also told them that the President was irrevocably against busing to achieve racial balance where such busing interferes with the ability of an individual to receive a quality education; that the President was in favor of the neighborhood school concept; that the President feels, as I do, that to attempt to attack de facto segregation in the South and leave it alone in the rest of the country is not a fair approach, and, moreover, that de facto segregation, even if overcome legislatively or judicially, will simply result in patterns of resegregation later on. Because one of the things in this country that stands out above all is the known independence of the American person in not allowing himself to be positioned rigidly in any particular area if he wants to move somewhere else.

We're in for a lot of . . . we've got a lot of headaches on this problem yet. The desegregation problem is fuzzy, the courts are still in the process of clarifying what they mean. We've got some cases that are on the way to the Supreme Court now that we hope will result in more equitable construction of the efforts that are being made here as compared with the rest of the country. But I don't find a volatile blind hostility to what's going on that I saw developing maybe seven or eight months ago.

MR. ZEWE: Can the Justice Department's opinion of earlier

this week that neighborhood schools should be kept intact be interpreted by anyone as a indirect endorsement of freedom of choice advocates?

Justice Opinion Hard to Interpret

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: I suppose there are some that would construe it to be at least leaning in that direction. I'm not sure it can. These questions of whether the Justice department's recent position does, in effect, amount to an implied acceptance of freedom of choice is a hard thing to come by, it's a legalistic argument that we could spend all day on. But the Justice Department really has a functional job of trying to smooth the rough edges of applying the law and that's exactly what the Attorney General is most interested in. And freedom of choice . . . you may notice that the IRS decision that forbids discrimination in private schools that want to have a tax deduction, in effect, amounts to freedom of choice. In other words, those private schools who were accepting Negro applicants from any area are applying freedom of choice. So I suppose there's some validity to the argument that there is a relationship.

MR. RANDAZZO: Mr. Vice President, do you have any thoughts on Gov. McKeithen at all becoming a possible candidate in a third party for President or as a Senatorial candidate.

VICE PRESIDENT AG-

NEW: Well, the governor is known as a fellow governor. He's a very interesting person. (Laughter)

MR. HEALY: Did you take any heart from the testimony before a Congressional subcommittee yesterday by the editor of the Black Panther paper in California?

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: I didn't see that.

MR. HEALY: With regard to cartoons, he said cartoons should not be taken seriously. Well, they had a cartoon saying 'Kill All Pigs'. They meant only black pigs; if they had a cartoon saying 'Stamp Out Litterbugs' they didn't mean that

Continued in Sec. 1, Page. 23

everybody should go out and step on a litterbug. (Laughter).

Many Cartoons Quite Impudent

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Actually, Mr. Healy, on the cartoon thing I get pretty much of a kick out of some of them. They can be extremely impudent. If they're funny, I like them. Some of them are a little bit sick here and there. But

many of them are quite hostile and still quite interesting. I look back in cartoons . . . there's a book that's been put out not too long ago that depicts the Presidency and the Vice Presidency going back to George Washington's time and they have a lot of the old woodblock cartoons in here. And I suppose if I think these cartoons are rough, I should see what they did to Blaine and some of those people. Boy, they were really something in those days.

MR. BRUMFIELD: Mr. Vice President, I don't know whether it's fair to ask you to discuss trade secrets . . .

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Trade secrets?

MR. BRUMFIELD: Trade secrets. Well, it probably falls under the category of trade secrets. I frequently read that you're responsible or are the author of your colorful phrases. Sometimes I read that somebody else authors them. But there was one that particularly interested me and I'm rather fascinated—it's nattering nabobs of negativism. (Laughter) I wonder how you came across that.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: Well, I'm not going to get into designating the authors of each phrase I use. I'll just put it this way: I think of some of them, some of my speechwriters think of some of them, and I have a personal hand in every speech I make. That doesn't mean that every phrase in it is offered by me. But it does mean that I go over and work my speeches myself. They're not handed to me on any platter. I would also take credit for some of the most widely-publicized morsels within those speeches. (Laughter).

MR. PHELPS: Mr. Vice President, you've been very generous with your time. I know you're on a tight schedule and we don't want to impose on

your time anymore than we have already. It's been very informative for us and very gratifying to have you take this amount of time to educate us and discuss things with us.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW:
Well, I've been educated, too.
(Laughter) Thank you.

MR. PHELPS: Thank you so much, sir.

THE TIMES-PICAYUNE, NEW ORLEANS, LA., FRIDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 9, 1970

Quizzed by Newspaper Editors

Agnew Greeted by Members of Times-Picayune Staff



SHAKING HANDS Thursday as staff members of The Times-Picayune met the vice president are Fritz Harsdorff, city editor of The Times-Picayune, and Spiro T. Agnew, the vice president. At left is Vincent P. Randazzo Jr., assistant city

editor. Editor George W. Healy Jr. is in the light-colored suit. The vice president conferred with newspaper staffers in the company building, 3800 Howard Ave.

—Photo by The Times-Picayune.